

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

To: CLEEVE James Harold Findlay Lloiyd Wise Tanjong Pagar P O Box 636 910816 Singapore		<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; display: inline-block;"> D D O Y D W I S E 0 6 FEB 2006 </div>	<h2 style="margin: 0;">PCT</h2>
DUE DATE <div style="font-size: 1.5em; font-family: cursive;">24.4.06</div> ENTERED		WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1)	
Applicant's or agent's file reference FP2334		FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below	
International application No. PCT/SG 2004/000309	International filing date (day/month/year) 23 September 2004 (23.09.2004)	Priority Date (day/month/year) 23 September 2003 (23.09.2003)	
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC G06Q99/00			
Applicant LOH TIEN WAI			

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Cont. No. I	Basis of the opinion
<input type="checkbox"/>	Cont. No. II	Priority
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Cont. No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
<input type="checkbox"/>	Cont. No. IV	Lack of unity of invention
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Cont. No. V	Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
<input type="checkbox"/>	Cont. No. VI	Certain documents cited
<input type="checkbox"/>	Cont. No. VII	Certain defects in the international application
<input type="checkbox"/>	Cont. No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/ AT Austrian Patent Office Dresdner Straße 87, A-1200 Vienna Facsimile No. +43 / 1 / 534 24 / 535	Authorized officer BEZIRGAN A. Telephone No. +43 / 1 / 534 24 / 572
---	--

Continuation No. I

Basis of the opinion

IAP20 Rec'd PCT/PTO 22 MAR 2006

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed.

Continuation No. III:

**Non-establishment of opinion with regard to
novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability**

The questions whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non obvious), or to be industrially applicable have not been examined in respect of the said entire international application because said entire international application relate to the following subject matter which does not require an international preliminary examination (specify):

schemes, rules, or methods of performing purely mental acts;

no international search report has been established for said claims Nos. 1-17.

Continuation No. V

2. Citations and explanations:

The current patent application basically contains a design guideline for dynamic web sites. A human designer has to execute the steps constituting the method. For example, claim 1 states that a set of use-patterns, interfaces, methods in the interfaces, and tags have to be defined – all activities a human designer has to perform. The patent application describes a smart and advantageous way of performing the purely mental activity of designing and structuring a web site. Such guidelines for purely mental activities are subject matters excluded from search and examination. Note that achieving the goals stated in the application, like separation of design and logic and reduction of the number of special tags needed, depends on the ingenuity of the designer, even if he uses the method described.

Claims 9, 15, and 16 are invalid since they only describe desirable effects or are only statements of problems.
